



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/505,810	02/17/2000	Kyoko Kawaguchi	32410	7331

116 7590 12/17/2002

PEARNE & GORDON LLP
526 SUPERIOR AVENUE EAST
SUITE 1200
CLEVELAND, OH 44114-1484

EXAMINER

BASHORE, ALAIN L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3624

DATE MAILED: 12/17/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/505,810

Applicant(s)

KAWAGUCHI ET AL.

Examiner

Alain L. Bashore

Art Unit

3624

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Alain L. Bashore.

(3) _____.

(2) Robert Bodi.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 12-9-02 & 12-16-02.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Williams; Goldschlag and Walker et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Arguments are attached that were discussed at the interview. The examiner will reconsider the rejection made of record in this case.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


VINCENT MILLIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case unless both applicant and examiner agree that the examiner will record same. Where the examiner agrees to record the substance of the interview, or when it is adequately recorded on the Form or in an attachment to the Form, the examiner should check the appropriate box at the bottom of the Form which informs the applicant that the submission of a separate record of the substance of the interview as a supplement to the Form is not required.

It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

1-703-746-7353

To: Alain Bashore, Examiner
From: Robert Bodi, applicant's representative
Subject: Issues for Discussion for Interview on November 26, 2002

Applicant will amend claim 3 as recommended to provide proper antecedent basis.

Applicant wishes to discuss and, only if necessary, amend the claim language to clarify the issues listed below. Applicant expects that the Interview will help the Examiner understand the invention and the differences between the invention and the cited references.

Note that the information listed below is for discussion purposes only, and is not to be used for any other purpose.

A. "real-time" versus a "predetermined date and time"

Claim 1 recites an electronic asset that is transmitted at a *predetermined date and time* by a server (lines 3-4 & 9-10).

The prior art merely shows an electronic asset being issued at the time of the transaction. The transaction is triggered by the user. Thus, the date and time are not predetermined, but depend on the triggering time and the processing time, and thus are not determinat.

The Examiner states that a "real-time" methodology includes a "predetermined date and time". The applicant disputes this definition. The completion time and date of a real-time process is not *predetermined* in the reference. It's completion time is based on a starting time of the triggering event, and on the processing time of the system. In contrast, a *predetermined* event is one that is scheduled to occur at some *specific time in the future*, irrespective of the starting time of any event (one can say, in fact, that there is no triggering "event" before issuance, except for the arrival of the predetermined time). In other words, the electronic asset is issued at a time certain, at a particular time.

For example, it might be issued on the day of a concert, or on a holiday, despite the fact that it may have been purchased hours, days, weeks, or months before.

Neither of the references suggest scheduling an event to occur at some specific date and time in the future. Instead, the references merely teach that one event occurs after another triggering event during the same transaction. Even if this is not properly described as "real-time", it also does not describe a "predetermined date and time." Applicant believes that the current claim language adequately captures this difference.

B. Issuing an "exchange certificate" (or a receipt certificate) AND later an "electronic asset", wherein the certificate is exchanged (traded) for the electronic asset.

Claim 1 recites "issuance means for issuing an exchange certificate verifying a user's right to receive the electronic asset, and also for issuing the electronic asset corresponding to the exchange certificate." (lines 5-7). Claim 3 describes an exchange certificate being exchanged for an electronic asset (lines 9-10).

None of the references suggest first issuing an exchange certificate to a terminal, and then exchanging the exchange certificate for an electronic asset (wherein the server issues the electronic asset).

The Office action states that the applicant has said that the certificate "becomes" the electronic asset, or that the certificate is "transformed" into the electronic asset. Nowhere does the applicant say any such thing. "Exchanging" does not imply a transformation. The exchange certificate is exchanged for the electronic asset, one does not become the other. The terminal must send the exchange certificate to the server for the server to issue the electronic asset to the terminal (or another designated terminal) This is not a transformation, as the Office action seems to imply, it is an exchange.

Williams merely teaches issuing a certificate as a receipt showing that a transaction has been completed (see col. 11, lines 35-42, figs 5A and 5B). Williams does not suggest issuing an exchange certificate to be exchanged for the electronic asset. Goldschlag does not overcome the Williams' shortcomings. Goldschlag teaches a means of issuing and re-issuing a specific type of electronic asset (called a certificate) in an anonymous manner, so that the user cannot be tracked. The user may submit an unvalidated certificate and a validated certificate, and the system validates the unvalidated certificate, transforming it into a validated certificate. The validated certificate is not issued by any server. Instead, the user supplies the unvalidated certificate which is converted into a validated certificate by the vendor terminal (see col. 4, lines 41-64). Only certificates are ever issued. Thus, the combination of references does not teach the issuance of an exchange certificate to be exchanged for an electronic asset, as claimed.